

In the Claims

Please amend claims 1 and 18 as shown in the APPENDIX A attached hereafter. The entire set of the pending claims is provided in the APPENDIX B attached hereafter.

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated September 18, 2002, claims 1 and 18 have been amended. Claims 1-21 are active in this application, of which claims 1, 6 and 17 are independent.

Entry of the Amendments and Remarks is respectfully requested because entry of Amendment places the present application in condition for allowance, or in the alternative, better form for appeal. No new matters are believed to be added by this Amendments. Based on the above Amendments and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the outstanding objections and rejections and they be withdrawn.

Interview

Applicant appreciates the telephone interview with the Examiner on November 4, 2002. In this response, Applicant has pointed out what has been discussed and agreed during the interview.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

In the Office Action, claims 1-8 and 16-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) for being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,295,043 issued to Hashimoto, *et al.* ("Hashimoto"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated “[t]he Examiner believes that the device taught by Hashimoto is well capable of applying data voltage of different polarities as claimed. Figure 2A of Hashimoto et al. is a good example of that” (Office Action, page 5).

Figs. 2A to 2D of Hashimoto show frame inversion, line inversion, column inversion and dot inversion, respectively, which are conventionally well known polarity inversion schemes. As described in the background portion (Specification, page 3, line 5 to page 7, line 15) and Figs. 1a, 1b and 2-5 of the present application, each of these four conventional inversion methods has problems and drawbacks, and the present invention was introduced to solve the problems and drawbacks accompanied with these conventional inversion system.

Briefly speaking, in the present invention, the problems are solved by “dividing the plurality of pixels into *a plurality of groups*” and “applying a data voltage of a positive polarity or a negative polarity with respect to the common voltage alternately to each group per frame” such that “*the polarity of the data voltage applied to the pixels in the same group is the same*” (claim 1).

For example, Figs. 6a and 6b of the present application shows the pixels are divided into a plurality of groups, each group comprising three pixels. Although, Figs. 6a and 6b shows each group comprising three pixels, “the number of pixels in the pixel group is not limited to this number” (Specification, Page 12, Lines 5-6).

Figs. 2A to 2D of Hashimoto fails to teach or suggest the group inversion scheme, as recited in independent claims 1, 6 and 17. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 6 and 17 are patentable over Hashimoto. Also, claims 2-5, 7, 8, 16 and 18 that are dependent from independent claims 1, 6 and 17 would be patentable at least for the same reason.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection over claims 1-8 and 16-18 be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action, claims 9-15 and 19-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being unpatentable over Hashimoto. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 9-15 and 19-21 are dependent from independent claims 6 and 17. As previously mentioned, claims 6 and 17 are believed to be patentable over Hashimoto. No secondary reference has been introduced to cure the deficiency from the teachings of Hashimoto. Thus, claims 9-15 and 19-21 would be also patentable at least for the same reason. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection over claims 9-15 and 19-21 be withdrawn.

Other Matters


In this response, claims 1 and 18 have been amended for clarification purposed only.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, claims 1-21 are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: December 18, 2002

McGuire Woods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Tel: 703-712-5000
Fax: 703-712-5050
HCP:WSC/kbs